

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 3, 2006. Claims 1 to 30 and 33 are pending in the application, of which Claims 2 to 6, 8 to 9, 11 to 15, 17 to 21, 23, 25 to 26, 28, 30 and 33 have been withdrawn from further consideration due to a restriction requirement. Claims 1, 2, 7 to 11, 16, 17 and 33 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants note that in the restriction requirement dated December 14, 2005, Claim 23 is included in Group II. However, Claim 23 depends from Claim 2, a Group III claim. Applicants believe that Claim 23 was inadvertently included in Group II, and wish merely to point out this discrepancy.

In the Office Action, all claims except Claims 1, 7, 10, 16, 22, 24, 27 and 29 (the Group II claims) were withdrawn from further consideration on the merits, pursuant to the above-noted restriction requirement. In this regard, Applicants timely filed an election with traverse on January 12, 2006, yet the instant Office Action does not acknowledge or reply to the arguments advanced by Applicants in the traversal, as is required by MPEP § 821.01. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,510,413 (Walker). Claims 22, 24, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Walker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,677 (Capek). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns communicating with a server and a browser and creating synthetic voice data. Data is obtained from a server according to a request from a browser apparatus, and synthetic voice data is created indicating a part or

the whole of the contents of the obtained data. Among its many features, the present invention includes the feature of forming data by adding an identifier to the data obtained from the server according to the request from the browser. The identifier is comprised of text data, and it indicates where synthetic voice data is stored.

By virtue of this arrangement, a user may more easily access synthetic voice data.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a data processing apparatus capable of communicating with a server and a browser apparatus via a network. The apparatus includes means for obtaining data from the server according to a request from the browser apparatus, means for creating synthetic voice data indicating a part or the whole of the contents of the obtained data, means for storing the synthetic voice data, means for forming data by adding to the obtained data an identifier which is comprised of text data and which indicates a location where the synthetic voice data is stored, and means for providing the browser apparatus with the formed data.

Independent Claims 7, 10 and 16 are directed to a system, a method, and a recording medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of forming data by adding an identifier to data obtained from a server according to a request from a browser, wherein the identifier is comprised of text data and indicates where synthetic voice data is stored.

As understood by Applicants, Walker describes converting text to be synthesized into human speech into an intermediate form representation which describes

the acoustic-periodic resolution of the spoken version of the text. The intermediate form is generated manually or by a program, and is later downloaded to client computers which synthesize the intermediate form representation to audio using a speech rendering program. See Walker, Abstract.

Page 3 of the Office Action asserts that Walker (Column 1, line 43 to Column 2, line 11) discloses means for forming data by adding to obtained data an identifier indicating a location where synthetic voice data is stored. Applicants respectfully submit that this portion of Walker does not disclose the addition of a location identifier to obtained data, as discussed more fully below.

In this regard, the portions of Walker cited by the Office Action simply describe conventional methods for generating a digital audio waveform from text, including using a sequence specification to modulate a base waveform or pre-recorded audio portions. See Walker, Column 1, lines 43 to 62. In the context of web-based applications, text may be designated by a web-page designer as text that users of the website can hear as well as read, and the text may thus be converted to a digital audio waveform. See Walker, Column 1, line 64 to Column 2, line 11.

However, the cited portions of Walker are not seen to disclose or suggest adding an identifier to the text for accessing the digital audio waveform. Specifically, the cited portions are seen to disclose processes for converting text to speech, but there is not seen to be any suggestion of adding an identifier to the text once an audio file has been generated. See Walker, Figure 1. Additionally, Walker is not seen to disclose that text to be converted is obtained from a server according to a request from a browser.

As Walker is not seen to disclose the identifier of the present invention, Walker is also not seen to disclose or suggest such an identifier comprised of text, as recited in the present invention.

Accordingly, Walker is not seen to disclose or suggest adding, to data obtained from a server according to a request from a browser, an identifier which is comprised of text data and which indicates where synthetic voice data is stored.

Capek has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Walker. In this regard, page 4 of the Office Action asserts that Capek (Column 1, line 55 to Column 2, line 24) discloses an identifier added as a tag to markup language. However, the cited portions of Capek are seen simply to describe the basic operation of web browsers. While Capek describes using a URL tag to reference “audio files” in general, there is not seen to be any disclosure of a URL tag referencing synthetic voice data which indicates the contents of data obtained from a server, much less forming data by adding, to data obtained from a server according to a request from a browser, an identifier which is comprised of text data and which indicates where synthetic voice data indicating the contents of the obtained data is stored.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Turning to a formal matter, Applicants respectfully request that the next Office communication include an initialed Form PTO-1449 indicating that the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated June 14, 2005 have been considered.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael K. O'Neill", written over a horizontal line.

Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 116238v1